

The Subjunctive and Indicative Moods in Turkish

Esra Predolac

esrap@ku.edu

University of Kansas

1 Introduction

The focus of this paper is on two types of nominalized embedded clauses, namely clauses constructed with the suffix *-mA* and those constructed with the suffix *-DIK/-AcAK*. Both of these suffixes are attached to verbs and create nominalizations in embedded contexts. Thus, *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* are standardly referred to as nominalizing suffixes. Below are examples of such nominalized clauses, which are also the most frequently occurring types of embedded clauses in Turkish:

Nominalized Clause, -DIK and -AcAK

- (1) Tuğçe-Ø [biz-**im** Ankara-ya git-**tiğ-imiz**]-**i**
Tuğçe-Nom [we-Gen Ankara-Dat go-DIK-3SgPoss]-Acc
san-ıyor-Ø.
believe-Prog-3Sg
‘Tuğçe believes that we went to Ankara.’
- (2) Tuğçe-Ø [biz-**im** Ankara-ya gid-**eceğ-imiz**]-**i**
Tuğçe-Nom [we-Gen Ankara-Dat go-AcAK-3SgPoss]-Acc
san-ıyor-Ø.
believe-Prog-3Sg
‘Tuğçe believes that we will go to Ankara.’

Nominalized Clause, -mA

- (3) Tuğçe-Ø [biz-**im** Ankara-ya git-**me-miz**]-**i** iste-di-Ø.
 Tuğçe-Nom [we-Gen Ankara-Dat go-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc want-Past-3Sg
 ‘Tuğçe wanted for us to go to Ankara.’

A brief look at table 1.1 shows that *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* have received many different labels:

	Labels of <i>-DIK/-AcAK</i> and <i>-mA</i>
Lees (1965)	-DIK/-AcAK is factive nominal; -mA is an action nominal
Underhill (1976)	-DIK/-AcAK and -mA are gerundives
Kornfilt (1984)	-DIK and -mA are participial forms; -DIK is a factive nominal and -mA an action nominal
Kennelly (1996)	-DIK/-AcAK are aspectual markers that are distinct from main clause tenses
Kural (1993)	-DI is the past tense marker; -AcAK is the future marker; -mA is an infinitive; -mAK is an infinitive; -K is a complementizer
Aygen (2002, 2007)	-DIK is a perfect aspect morpheme
Kornfilt (2003, 2007)	-DIK: factive (=indicative)) nominalized embedding; -AcAK: future factive (=indicative)) nominalized embedding; -mA: non-factive (=subjunctive) nominalized embedding
Keskin (2009)	-DIK is factive nominalizer; -mA is an action nominal

Table 1.1: Labels of *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* Suffixes

While the exact classification of the so-called nominalizers *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* is under debate, the following properties of clauses formed with these nominalizers is acknowledged:

- The subject of nominalized clauses bears genitive Case
- The subject-verb agreement is nominal rather than verbal
- All nominalized clauses are Case-marked

These properties of nominalized clauses are exemplified from (1) to (3). This set of properties is also found in regular NPs in Turkish. As example (4) shows, the possessor

biz ‘we’ is marked with the genitive case and the agreement on the “possessee” *kitab* ‘book’ is from the nominal paradigm. Furthermore, this NP receives Case (in this case the accusative):

Noun Phrase

- (4) Tolga *biz-im* kitab-*ımız-ı* al-dı-Ø
Tolga we-**Gen** book-**1PlPoss-Acc** take-Past-3Sg
‘Tolga took our book.’

1.1 Aims of the paper

The aim of this paper is to provide evidence that clauses constructed with *-mA* are subjunctive clauses and that clauses in which the *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalizer is used are indicative clauses. Seemingly puzzling semantic and syntactic properties of such clauses are shown to follow from this analysis. Section 2 lists the reason for this classification of *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK*. Section 3 shows that factivity (or the lack thereof) is not what determines the choice between *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses. Section 4 concludes this paper.

2 *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* as Markers of Mood

In this section various pieces of evidence are given to show that nominalizers *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* are in fact markers of mood, and that mood is what determines the choice between using a *-mA* or *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalizer in embedded contexts.

2.1 Parallels with Embedded Root Clauses

In a few works by Kornfilt (2003, 2007) *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* have been referred to as indicative and subjunctive nominalizers respectively. This section shows that the descriptions of *-DIK/-AcAK* as an indicative marker and *-mA* as a subjunctive

marker are correct, but for many more reasons than previously given.

The reason why Kornfilt (2003, 2007) uses the term indicative for *-DIK/-AcAK* and subjunctive for *-mA* is based on the parallelism that the *-mA* clause has with its embedded root clause counterpart. Turkish has a predicate form that appears in root clauses that is called the subjunctive (also the optative):

- (5) Ben-Ø bugün yemek pişir-**e**-yim
 I-Nom today food cook-**Sbjnctv**-1Sg
 ‘I should/ought to cook food today; Let me cook food today.’
 (Kornfilt, 2003)

Such subjunctive clauses can also be embedded as root clauses by the matrix verb *iste-mek* ‘to want’:

- (6) [Ben-Ø bugün yemek pişir-**e**-yim] isti-yor-um
 [I-Nom today food cook-**Sbjnctv**-1Sg] want-Prog-1Sg
 ‘I want to cook [that I should cook] food today; I want for myself to cook food today.’
 (Kornfilt, 2003)

Besides a root clause, the verb *iste-mek* ‘to want’ may take a nominalized clause. In such cases the nominalizer that shows up in the embedded nominalized clause is *-mA* (7). The *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalizer cannot occur in such contexts (8).

- (7) [Sen-in yarın ev-de yemek pişir-**me**-n]-i
 [You-Gen tomorrow home-Loc food cook-**mA**-2SgPoss]-Acc
 isti-yor-um
 want-Prog-1Sg
 ‘I want for you to cook food at home tomorrow; I want that you should cook food at home tomorrow.’
 (Kornfilt, 2003)

- (8) *[Sen-in yarın ev-de yemek pişir-**eceğ**-in]-i
 [You-Gen tomorrow home-Loc food cook-**AcAK**-2SgPoss]-Acc
 isti-yor-um
 want-Prog-1Sg

Kornfilt (2003) states that because *iste-mek* ‘to want’ selects for an embedded root clause that is in the subjunctive, the embedded nominalized clause selected by *iste-mek* ‘to want’ must be in the subjunctive as well.

2.2 Temporal Relations

It is well-known that indicative clauses have tense properties that are independent of that of the matrix clause, whereas subjunctive clauses do not encode tense and solely rely on the matrix clause for tense specifications (see Picallo (1985), among others).¹

For example, in the Spanish examples in (9), the embedded indicative clause is not affected by the temporal specification in the main clause and thus, any combination of tenses in the complex construction is allowed. For example, (9a) shows that even though the main clause verb is in the present, the embedded verb may be in the past. Similarly, if the main clause verb is in the past, as in (9b), the embedded verb may be in the present or future:

(9) *Indicative Clauses, Spanish*

- a. Platón dice [CP C que Aristóteles {lee/leía/leerá} a
 Plato say.3Sg [that Aristotle read.{Pres/Past/Fut}.3Sg to
 Sócrates].
 Socrates]
 ‘Plato says that Aristotle {reads/ read/ will read} Socrates.’
- b. Platón dijo [CP C que Aristóteles {lee/leía/leerá} a
 Plato say.Past.3Sg [that Aristotle read.{Pres/Past/Fut}.3Sg to
 Sócrates].
 Socrates]
 ‘Plato said that Aristotle {reads/ read} Socrates.’

(Torrego and Uriagereka, 1992)

Subjunctive clauses, however, are not autonomous in their tense marking. In the case

¹Picallo (1985) specifies subjunctives as [-Tense, +Agreement]. She further states that the relation between the [tense] specification of a subjunctive [CP] and that of its main clause may be compared to the relation between an anaphor and its antecedent.

of Spanish, although subjunctive forms can be expressed in two tenses (corresponding to [-past] and [+past]), it is argued that subjunctive morphology indicates an unrealized tense as subjunctive clauses do not possess a reference of their own in their time-frame (cf. Picallo (1985), Bresnan (1972), Bouchard (1982)). The specification of a subjunctive clause as either [-past] or [+past] is dependent on the specification on the tense in the main clause:

(10) *Subjunctive Clauses, Spanish*

- a. Platón quiere $[_{CP} C \text{ que Aristóteles } \{\text{lea}/\text{*leyera}/\text{*leyere}\}$
 Plato want.3Sg $[\quad \text{that Aristotle read.Subj.}\{\text{Pres/Past/Fut}\}.3\text{Sg}$
 a Sócrates].
 to Socrates]
 ‘Plato wants Aristotle to {read/ read/ will read} Socrates.’
- b. Platón quería $[_{CP} C \text{ que Aristóteles}$
 Plato want.Past.3Sg $[\quad \text{that Aristotle}$
 $\{\text{*lea}/\text{leyera}/\text{*leyere}\} \quad \text{a Sócrates}].$
 read.Subj. $\{\text{Pres/Past/Fut}\}.3\text{Sg}$ to Socrates
 ‘Plato wanted Aristotle to {read/read/will read} Socrates.’

(Torrego and Uriagereka, 1992)

In Turkish, the nominalizers *-DIK* and *-AcAK* encode tense: *-DIK* marks [-Fut] events, and *-AcAK* is the marker of [+Fut]. Clauses formed with the *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalizers have tense properties that are independent of the matrix clause. As shown in example (11), the complement of *duy-* ‘hear’ can be either past, present, or future relative to the time of hearing (11):

(11) *Embedded Nominalized Clause with -DIK [-Fut] and -AcAK [+Fut] Nominalizers*

- a. Asu $[\text{Ece-nin kitap yaz-} \mathbf{dığ}\text{-in} \quad]_{-1} \text{ duy-} \mathbf{acak}\text{-}\emptyset.$
 Asu $[\text{Ece-Gen book write-DIK-3SgPoss}]_{-1} \text{ Acc hear-Fut-3Sg}$
 ‘Asu will hear that Ece writes/ is writing/ wrote/ has written/ had
 written/ has been writing a book.’

- b. Asu [Ece-nin kitap yaz-**acağ**-ın]-1 duy-**acak**-Ø.
Asu [Ece-Gen book write-AcAK-3SgPoss]-Acc hear-Fut-3Sg
‘Asu will hear that Ece will write a book.’
- c. Asu [Ece-nin kitap yaz-**diğ**-in]-1 duy-**du**-Ø.
Asu [Ece-Gen book write-AcAK-3SgPoss]-Acc hear-Past-3Sg
‘Asu heard that Ece writes/ is writing/ wrote/ has written/ had written/
has been writing a book.’
- d. Asu [Ece-nin kitap yaz-**acağ**-ın]-1 duy-**du**-Ø.
Asu [Ece-Gen book write-AcAK-3SgPoss]-Acc hear-Past-3Sg
‘Asu heard that Ece will write a book.’

On the other hand, clauses formed with the nominalizer *-mA* have a more restricted temporal interpretation than indicative clauses. The nominalizer *-mA* does not encode any tense, nor can it be used in conjunction with any tense/aspect marker. Since the *-mA* clause does not determine where its event should be put, it is fully dependent on the matrix clause for tense specification. For example, the complement of *iste*- ‘want’ must be interpreted as present or future relative to the time of *wanting* in (12), regardless of whether the main clause verb is in the past, as in (12a), or present, as in (12b),

(12) *Embedded Nominalized Clauses with the -mA Nominalizer*

- a. Asu [Ece-nin kitap yaz-**ma**-sın]-1 iste-**di**-Ø.
Asu [Ece-Gen book write-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc want-Past-3Sg
‘Asu wanted Ece to write a book.’
- b. Asu [Ece-nin kitap yaz-**ma**-sın]-1 isti-**yor**-Ø.
Asu [Ece-Gen book write-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc want-Prog-3Sg
‘Asu wants Ece to write a book.’

2.3 Mood Distribution

To account for the distribution of the subjunctive and indicative moods across languages is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, it has been acknowledged that

mood distribution is not completely random (cf. Farkas, 1992, among others). For example, the groups of verbs that govern subjunctive complements have been given the following semantic labels:²

- desideratives: *want, wish, desire, ...*
- directives: *order, ask, request, ...*
- permissives and interdirectives: *allow, forbid, ...*
- factive emotives: *regret, be sad, ...* (Farkas, 1992)

Verbs governing the indicative can be grouped under various semantic labels as well:

- declaritives: verbs of saying, ...
- predicates of certainty: *know, be sure, ...*
- fiction verbs: *dream, imagine, lie, ...*
- commissives: *promise, ...* (Farkas, 1992)

Crucially, verbs that govern *-mA* clauses overlap with the verbs that govern the subjunctive in other languages. Likewise, verbs that govern *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses in Turkish govern the indicative mood:³

(13) *-mA Clause with verbs that govern the subjunctive*

- a. Hakan [Timur-un git-me-sin]-i ist-iyor-Ø/
Hakan [Timur-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc want-Prog-3Sg/
emred-iyor-Ø.
order-Prog-3Sg
‘Hakan wants/ orders for Timur to go.’

²Despite the overlap of indicative and subjunctive governors across languages, there are some well-known cross-linguistic differences. For example, epistemic predicates select for a subjunctive proposition in Italian, but an indicative one in French and Romanian. Likewise, factive-emotives (true factives) select for the indicative in Romanian, but select for either the indicative or subjunctive in French. Moreover, control predicates select for the infinitive in French, but for the subjunctive in Romanian. In Turkish, epistemic predicates select for the indicative, factive-emotives (true factives) can select for either the indicative or subjunctive, and control predicates select for the infinitive.

³Due to limitations of space, a list of verbs/predicates with their mood preferences cannot be given here.

- b. Hakan [Timur-un git-me-sin]-e izin ver-di-Ø/
 Hakan [Timur-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss]-Dat permission give-Past-3Sg/
 üzül-dü-Ø.
 be.sad-Past-3Sg
 ‘Hakan allowed/ was sad for Timur to go.’

(14) -DIK/-AcAK *Clause with verbs that govern the indicative*

- a. Hakan [Timur-un git-tiğ-in]-i söyle-di-Ø/
 Hakan [Timur-Gen go-DIK-3SgPoss]-Acc say-Past/
 bil-iyor-Ø/ hayal et-ti-Ø.
 know-Prog-3Sg/ imagine do-Past-3Sg
 ‘Hakan said/ knows/ imagined that Timur went/ left.’
- b. Hakan [Timur-un gid-eceğ-in]-e söz ver-di-Ø.
 Hakan [Timur-Gen go-AcAK-3SgPoss]-Dat word give-Past-3Sg
 ‘Hakan promised that Timur will go.’

Note that there are instances where the same verb may take both a subjunctive and an indicative clause, in which case the meaning of the verb changes depending on the mood of the complement:

(15) *Catalan verb dir ‘to say’ governing both the subjunctive and the indicative*

- a. Diu que t-enyora.
 say.3Sg that you-miss.3Sg.IND
 ‘She says that she misses you.’
- b. Diu que li escriguis.
 say.3Sg that her/him write.Pres.2Sg.SUB.
 ‘She tells you to write to her/him.’

(Quer, 1998)

(16) *Romanian verb a spune ‘to say’ governing both the subjunctive and the indicative*

- a. Ion a spus [că Maria a plecat].
 Ion has said [that.IND Maria has.IND. left].
 ‘Ion has said that Maria left.’ (translation mine)
- b. Ion a spus [ca Maria să plece imediat].
 Ion has said [that.SUB Maria SUB leave immediately].
 ‘Ion told Maria to leave immediately.’ (translation mine)

(Farkas, 1984)

In (15a) and (16a) the verb is a declarative as it conveys an assertion made by *she* and *Ion* respectively. In (15b) and (16b), however, the verb is a directive since it reports a directive of *she* and *Ion* respectively. The same observation is made in Turkish. The verb *söyle-* ‘to say’ can be used with both *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* clauses, but the meaning of the verb changes with the mood of the complement, in the same way it does in the Romanian and Catalan cases:

(17) *Söyle- ‘to say’ with -mA and -DIK/-AcAK*

- a. Hakan [Timur’un git-**tiğ**-in]-i **söyle**-di-Ø.
 Hakan [Timur-Gen go-**DIK**-3SgPoss]-Acc **say**-Past-3Sg
 ‘Hakan said that Timur went away/ left.’ *Declarative*
- b. Hakan [Timur’un git-**me**-sin]-i **söyle**-di-Ø.
 Hakan [Timur-Gen go-**mA**-3SgPoss]-Acc **say**-Past-3Sg
 ‘Hakan told Timur to go.’ *Directive*

With a *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalized clause the verb *söyle-* ‘to say’ is a declarative (17a), while with the *-mA* nominalized clause *söyle-* is a directive (17b). That *-mA* clauses occur with verbs that govern the subjunctive cross-linguistically, as well as the overlap of verbs that take a *-DIK/-AcAK* clause with the verbs that typically govern the indicative provides another piece of evidence that *-mA* clauses are subjunctive clauses and *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses are indicative clauses.

2.4 Types of Adjunct Clauses: Reason and Purpose Clauses

The types of adjunct clauses that occur with *-mA* on the one hand and *-DIK/-AcAK* on the other also demonstrate that the *-mA* clauses are subjunctive clauses, whereas *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses are indicative clauses. *Purpose clauses* are uniformly in the subjunctive mood across languages, whereas *reason clauses* uniformly govern the indicative:

- (18) Sono uscita di casa **affinché** lei **studi/ *studia** in
 I.am exited of house **so.that** she **study.3Sg.Subj./ study.3Sg.Ind.** in
 pace.
 peace
 ‘I left the house so that she studies in quiet.’ *Italian*
- (19) Yo me fui de la casa **para que** ella
 I Refl. go.1Sg.Preterit of the house **for that** she
estudiara/ *estudiaba en paz.
study.3Sg.Imperf.Subj./ study.3Sg.Imperf.Ind. in peace
 ‘I left the house so that she studies in quiet.’ *Spanish*

As predicted, the nominalizer that shows up in *purpose clauses* in Turkish is *-mA* :

- (20) [[Ezgi-nin rahatça ders çalış-**ma**-sı] **için**] ev-den
 [[Ezgi-Gen comfortably lesson study-**mA**-3SgPoss] **for**] house-Abl
 çık-tı-m.
 leave-Past-1Sg
 ‘I left the house so that Ezgi studies comfortably’ *Turkish*

As the following examples from Spanish and Italian show, *reason clauses* uniformly govern the indicative.

- (21) Sono uscita di casa **perché** Ø **ha/ *abbia**
 I.am exited of house **because** she/he **have.3Sg.Ind./ have.3Sg.Subj.**
 bisogno di carta.
 need of paper.
 ‘I left the house because she needs paper.’ *Italian*

- (22) Salí de la casa porque ella necesitaba/ *necesitara
 go.out.Preterit of the house because she need.3Sg.Imperf.Ind./
 papel.
 need.3Sg.Imperf.Subj. paper
 ‘I left the house because she needs paper.’ *Spanish*

Consistent with the Italian and Spanish data, *reason clauses* in Turkish are constructed with *-DIK/-AcAK* :

- (23) [[Ezgi-Ø acık-tığ-ı] için] yemek yap-tı-m.
 [[Ezgi-Nom get.hungry-DIK-3SgPoss] because/as] food do-Past-1Sg
 ‘I prepared food because Ezgi got hungry.’ *Turkish*

Data on adjunct clauses, too, give us proof that *-mA* clauses are subjunctive clauses and *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses are indicative clauses.

2.5 Subjunctive Obviation

It is well-known that the implicit subject of a subjunctive clause does not allow coindexation with the matrix subject, whereas the implicit subject of an indicative clause does. This requirement that a pronominal subject of a subjunctive clause be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject is known as *Subjunctive Obviation*. For example, in Italian the null (or clitic) subject of a subordinate clause cannot be coindexed with the subject of the related matrix clause if the embedded clause has a subjunctive verb:

Italian, Subjunctive

- (24) Gianni vuole che _ legga un libro a settimana.
 Gianni wants that reads(SUB) one book to week
 ‘Gianni want him/her to read one book every week’.
 *[_] = [Gianni] , [_] ≠ Gianni

Italian, Indicative

- (25) Gianni ha ditto che $_{-}$ legge un libro a settimana.
Gianni has said that $_{-}$ reads(IND) one book to week
'Gianni said he reads one book every week'.
 $[_{-}] = [\text{Gianni}]$, $[_{-}] \neq \text{Gianni}$ (Constantini, 2005)

The exact pattern is observed in other languages as well.

French, Subjunctive

- (26) Pierrei veut qu'il $^{*i/j}$ parte.
Pierre wants that-he leave(SUB)
'Pierrei wants him $^{*i/j}$ to leave.'

French, Indicative

- (27) Pierrei a promis qu'il i/j partira
Piere has promised that-he will-leaves(IND)
'Pierrei promised that he i/j to leave.' (Farkas, 1992)

Catalan, Subjunctive

- (28) [En Jordi] i espera que $pro^{*i/j}$ vingui.
[The Jordi] hopes that pro comes(SUB)
'Jordi i hopes that he $^{*i/j}$ /she will come'

Catalan, Indicative

- (29) [En Joan] i ha decidit que $pro^{i/j}$ telefonarà al Pere.
[The Joan] has decided that pro call(IND,Fut) to-the Pere
'Jordi i has decided that he i/j /she will call Pere' (Picallo, 1985)

Portuguese, Subjunctive

- (30) [O Manel]_i deseja que *pro*_{*i/j} leia mais livros.
[The Manel] wishes that *pro* reads(SUB) more books
'Manel_i wishes that he_{*i/j} /she read more books'

Portuguese, Indicative

- (31) [O Manel]_i pensa que *pro*_{i/j} lê bastanetes livros.
[The Manel] thinks that *pro* reads(IND) enough books
'Manel_i thinks that he_{i/j} /she reads more books' (Raposo, 1985)

As the next example shows, *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* also differ in how their implicit subjects are interpreted with respect to the subject in the matrix clause: the null subject of a *-mA* clause cannot be coindexed with the subject of the matrix clause, but no such restriction in the case of *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses exists:

-mA Clause

- (32) Arasi [Ø_{*i/j} kazan-ma-sın]₋₁ istiyor.
Aras [Ø win-mA-3Sg.Poss]_{-Acc} wants
'Arasi wants that he_{*i/j} wins.'

-DIK/-AcAK Clause

- (33) Arasi [Ø_{i/j} kazan-dığ-ın]₋₁ söyledi.
Aras [Ø win-DIK-3Sg.Poss]_{-Acc} said
'Arasi said that he_{i/j} won.'

The fact that *-mA* clauses, but not *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses exhibit subjunctive obviation is yet another piece of evidence that *-mA* clauses are subjunctive clauses, whereas *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses are indicatives.

2.6 No Narrow Wh-scope in Subjunctive Clauses

As frequently noted in the literature, narrow wh-scope is possible with *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses (35), but not with *-mA* clauses (34):

- (34) a. [yemeğ-i Ali-nin pişir-**me**-sin]-i söyle-di-m.
 [food-ACC Ali-GEN cook-NFN-3.Sg]-ACC tell-PAST-1.SG
 ‘I said that Ali should cook the food.’
- b. *[yemeğ-i **kim**-in pişir-**me**-sin]-i söyle-di-m.
 [food-ACC who-GEN cook-NFN-3.Sg]-ACC tell-PAST-1.SG
 Intended reading: ‘I said who should cook the food.’ (Kornfilt, 2003)
- (35) [yemeğ-i **kim**-in pişir-**diğ**-in]-i sor-du-m/
 [food-ACC who-GEN cook-FN-3.Sg]-ACC ask-PAST-1.Sg/
 duy-du-m/ söyle-di-m.
 hear-PAST-1.SG/ tell-PAST-1.SG
 ‘I asked/ heard/told who had cook the food.’ (Kornfilt, 2003)

Interestingly, it appears that it is a property of subjunctive clauses in general not to allow narrow wh-scope. The following examples illustrate this point:⁴

Lack of narrow wh-scope in Italian subjunctive clauses

- (36) Bill vuole che Sally **prepari** la cena.
 Bill wants.3Sg.Pres.Ind. that Sally **prepare.3Sg.Subj.** the dinner
 ‘Bill wants that Sally cooks dinner.’

⁴As is the case for Turkish, wide scope wh-readings of subjunctives in these languages are fine:

- (i) Elçin-Ø [**kim**-in yemek pişir-**me**-sin]-i iste-di-Ø?
 Elçin-Nom [who-Gen food cook-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc want-Past-3Sg
 ‘Who did Elçin want to cook food?’
- (ii) **Chi** é che Bill vuole che **prepari** la cena?
 Who is that Bill wants.3Sg.Pres.Ind. that prepare.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
 ‘Who does Bill want to cook dinner?’ *Compare with (37)*
- (iii) **¿Quien** quiere Bill que **cocine** la cena?
 who want.3Sg.Ind. Bill that cook.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
 ‘Who does Bill want to cook dinner?’ *Compare with (39)*

- (37) *Bill vuole (che) **chi prepari** la cena.
 Bill wants.3Sg.Pres. (that) who **prepare.3Sg.Subj.** the dinner
 Intended reading: ‘Bill wants that/for whom to cook dinner.’

Lack of narrow wh-scope in Spanish subjunctive clauses

- (38) Bill quiere que Sally **cocine** la cena.
 Bill want.3Sg.Ind. that Sally **cook.3Sg.Subj.** the dinner
 ‘Bill wants that Sally to cook dinner.’

- (39) *Bill quiere que **quien cocine** la cena.
 Bill want.3Sg.Ind. that who **cook.3Sg.Subj.** the dinner.
 Intended: ‘Bill want who cooks the food.’

Lack of narrow wh-scope in Romanian subjunctive clauses

- (40) Bill vrea ca Sally să gătească cina.
 Bill wants for Sally to cook dinner.
- (41) *Bill vrea ca cine să gătească cina.
 Bill wants for who to cook dinner.

For now, I simply assume that the reason why narrow wh-scope is not possible in such constructions is due to selection, i.e., none of the subjunctive-clause selecting verbs above select for a C [+wh].⁵ The main point here is that the lack of narrow wh-scope in *-mA* clauses is observed in other subjunctive clauses across languages.

Based on the evidence listed above, we conclude that *-mA* nominalized clauses are subjunctives, whereas *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalized clauses are indicatives.

⁵Note that even in English such constructions are bad. While assuming that selection is responsible for the lack of narrow wh-constructions in such sentences, I will not rule out the possibility that the semantics of the subjunctives might be the underlying reason for this selectional restriction. I will leave this issue for future research.

3 Is Factivity Involved?

Factivity has frequently been claimed to be the reason behind the selection of *-mA* vs. *-DIK/-AcAK* (see Table 1.1). However, evidence from the types of verbs/predicates *-mA* and *-DIK/-AcAK* are used with as well as NPI-licensing show that factivity is not involved in the choice between *-mA* vs. *-DIK/-AcAK*.

3.1 Types of Predicates

As shown below, factive and non-factive predicates may be used with both *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* nominalizers.⁶

-DIK/-AcAK Clause with Factive, Non-emotive Predicate *unut* ‘forget’

- (42) Alp-Ø [Gizem-**in** hasta ol-**duğ**-un]-**u** unut-tu-Ø.
 Alp-Nom [Gizem-Gen sick be-**DIK**-3SgPoss]-**Acc** forget-Past-3Sg
 ‘Alp forgot that Gizem is sick.’

⁶Further note that one class of predicates, true factives (a.k.a. factive, emotive predicates), can take both *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* clauses:

- (i) a. [Gizem-in yarışma-yı kazan-**ma**-sın]-a **sevin-di-m**.
 [Gizem-Gen competition-Acc win-**mA**-3SgPoss]-Dat **be.happy-Past-1Sg**
 ‘I’m happy that Gizem won the competition./ I’m happy for Gizem to win the competition’
 b. [Gizem-in yarışma-yı kazan-**diğ**-in]-a **sevin-di-m**.
 [Gizem-Gen competition-Acc win-**DIK**-3SgPoss]-Dat **be.happy-Past-1Sg**
 ‘I’m happy that Gizem won the competition.’

When a nominalized clause occurs in the subject position of such factive-emotive predicates, the nominalized clause is necessarily a *-mA* clause (cf. Kornfilt (2003)):

- (ii) a. [Gizem-in kazan-**ma**-sı]-Ø ben-i sevin-dir-di.
 [Gizem-Gen win-**mA**-3SgPoss]-Nom I-Acc be.happy-Caus-Past-3Sg
 ‘It made me happy that Gizem won.’ or ‘For Gizem to win made me happy.’
 b. *[Gizem-in kazan-**diğ**-ı]-Ø ben-i sevin-dir-di.
 [Gizem-Gen win-**DIK**-3SgPoss]-Nom I-Acc be.happy-Caus-Past-3Sg
 Intended: ‘It made me happy that Gizem won/ That Gizem won made me happy.’

-DIK/-AcAK *Clause with Non-Factive, Epistemic Predicate* düşün ‘think, assume’

- (43) Alp-Ø [Gizem-**in** hasta ol-**duğ**-un]-**u** düşün-üyor-Ø.
 Alp-Nom [Gizem-Gen sick be-**DIK**-3SgPoss]-**Acc** think-Prog-3Sg
 ‘Alp thinks that Gizem is sick.’

-mA *Clause with Non-factive, Emotive Predicate* imkansız ‘impossible’

- (44) [Gizem-**in** iyileş-**me**-si]-Ø imkansız.
 [Gizem-Gen heal/recover-**mA**-3SgPoss]-**Nom** impossible
 ‘For Gizem to recover is impossible/ It is impossible for Gizem to
 recover.’

-mA *Clause with Factive, Emotive Predicate* üzücü ‘sad’

- (45) [Gizem-**in** hasta ol-**ma**-sı]-Ø üzücü.
 [Gizem-Gen sick be-**mA**-3SgPoss]-**Nom** sad
 ‘For Gizem to be sick is sad/ It is sad that Gizem is sick.’

We thus see that factivity is not what determines the choice between -mA and -DIK/-AcAK .

3.2 NPI-Licensing

It is known that long-distance NPI-licensing in English is generally available in non-factive clausal complements but not in factives:

- (46) It’s **not likely** that he will lift a finger until it’s too late.
 (47) *It does **not bother** me that he will lift a finger until it’s too late.
 (Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970)
 (48) I **don’t believe** [(that) Jim slept a wink last night].
 (49) *I **don’t regret** [that Jim slept a wink last night]. (de Cuba, 2007)

As shown below, both *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* clauses can be used in contexts in which an NPI is licensed. However, factive clauses, whether formed with *-DIK/-AcAK* or *-mA*, do not license NPIs, whereas non-factives, regardless of whether they are formed with the *-DIK/-AcAK* or *-mA* nominalizer, generally do license NPIs.⁷

(50) *NPI-Licensing, Factive Clauses with -DIK/-AcAK and -mA*

- a. ***[Kimse-nin gel-diğ-in]-i unut-ma-dı-lar**
[Nobody-Gen come-DIK-3SgPoss]-Acc forget-Neg-Past-3Pl
 Intended: ‘They did not forget that anybody came.’
- b. ***[Kimse-nin git-me-sin]-e kız-ma-dı-m**
[Nobody-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc be.angry-Neg-Past-1Sg
 Intended: ‘I did not get angry that anybody went.’

(51) *NPI-Licensing, Non-factive Clauses with -DIK/-AcAK and -mA*

- a. **[Kimse-nin gel-eceğ-in]-i san-mi-yor-um**
[Nobody-Gen come-AcAK-3SgPoss]-Acc believe-Neg-Prg-1Sg
 ‘I don’t believe that anybody will come.’
- b. **[Kimse-nin gel-me-sin]-i iste-mi-yor-um**
[Nobody-Gen come-mA-3SgPoss]-Acc want-Neg-Prg-1Sg
 ‘I don’t want for anybody to come.’

Data from NPI-licensing further show that factivity does not determine the choice between *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA*.

4 Conclusion

I have provided evidence that mood, but not factivity, determines the choice between the *-DIK/-AcAK* and *-mA* : The *-DIK/-AcAK* nominalizer is shown here to be the indicative marker, whereas the *-mA* nominalizer is the subjunctive marker in Turkish.

⁷In fact, Keleşir (2001) already noted that it is the semantics of the predicates that determines whether or not long-distance NPIs are licensed. She lists the predicates that allow long-distance licensing, which are the so-called Neg-raising predicates, as *san-* ‘think’ and *iste-* ‘want’, perception predicates such as *duy-* ‘hear’, *gör-* ‘see’ and attitude predicates such as *izin ver-* ‘allow’.

References

- Aygen, Gülşat. 2002. Finiteness, case and clausal architecture. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Aygen, Gülşat. 2007. Syntax and semantics of genitive subject-case in Turkish. *California Linguistic Notes* 17.
- Bouchard, Denis. 1982. On the content of empty categories. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1972. Theory of complementation in English syntax. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Constantini, Francesco. 2005. Subjunctive obviation: an interface perspective. Doctoral Dissertation, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia.
- de Cuba, Carlos F. 2007. On (non)factivity, clausal complementation and the CP-field. Doctoral Dissertation, Stony Brook.
- Farkas, Donka. 1984. Subjunctive complements in Rumanian. In *Papers from the xiith linguistic symposium on romance languages*, ed. Philip Baldie, 355–372. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Farkas, Donka. 1992. On the semantics of subjunctive complements. In *Romance languages and modern linguistic theory*, ed. Paul Hirschbühler and E.F.K. Koerner, 69–105. John Benjamins.
- Kelepir, Meltem. 2001. Topics in Turkish syntax : clausal structure and scope. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kennelly, Sarah D. 1996. Turkish subordination [-Tense, -CP, +Case]. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, ed. Ahmet Konrot, Modern Studies in Turkish Linguistics. Eskisehir, Turkey: Anadolu University.
- Keskin, Cem. 2009. *Subject agreement-dependency of accusative case in Turkish- or jump-starting grammatical machinery*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In *Progress in linguistics*, ed.

- M. Bierwisch and K.E. Heidolph, 143–73. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1984. Case marking, agreement, and empty categories in Turkish. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2003. Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In *Syntactic structures and morphological information (=interface explorations)*, ed. Uwe Junghanns and Luka Szucsich, 129–215. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2007. Verbal and nominalized finite clauses in Turkish. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, ed. Irina Nikolaeva, 305–332. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kural, Murat. 1993. V-to(-I-to)-C in Turkish. *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 11:17–53.
- Lees, Robert. 1965. Turkish nominalization and a problem of ellipsis. *Foundations of Language* 1:112–121.
- Picallo, M. Carme. 1985. Opaque domains. Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY.
- Quer, Joseph. 1998. Mood at the Interface. Ph.d. thesis, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1985. Some asymmetries in the Binding Theory in Romance. *The Linguistic Review* 5:75–110.
- Torrego, Esther, and Juan Uriagereka. 1992. *Indicative dependents*. Ms. University of Massachusetts (Boston) and University of Maryland.
- Underhill, Robert. 1976. *Turkish grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.